

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC) MEETING

San Diego, June 7, 2007

The second CTCDC meeting of year 2007 was held in San Diego, on June 7, 2007.

Chairman Farhad Mansourian opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. with the introduction of Committee members and guests. The following Members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Members (Voting)		
Farhad Mansourian Chairman	CA State Association of Counties Marin County	(415) 499-6570
Hamid Bahaodri Vice-Chairman	Southern Auto Club	(714) 885-2326
John Fisher	League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles	(213) 972-8424
Wayne Henley	Caltrans	(916) 654-6246
Ed von Borstel	League of CA Cities City of Modesto	(209) 577-5266
Deborah Wong (Alternate)	California State Automobile Association	(415) 565-2297
Jacob Babico	CA State Association of Counties San Bernardino County	(909) 387-8186
Lujuanna Lopez	CHP	(916) 657-7222
<u>Alternate</u>		
Merry Banks (Voting Member)	California State Automobile Association	(415) 241-5847

ATTENDEES

ORGANIZATION

TELEPHONE/E-Mail

Ahmad Rastegarpour	Caltrans	ahmad_rastegarpour@dot.ca.gov
Johnny Bhullar	Caltrans	johnny_bhullar@dot.ca.gov
Charles gray	Caltrans	Charles_gray@dot.ca.gov
Vinh Nguyen	City of Santa Ana	vnguyen@ci.santa-ana.ca.us
Dave Royer	Consultant	droyerpe@earthlink.net (661) 255-6556
Zubir Ouadah	City of Poway	zouadah@ci.poway.ca.us
Carol Pedder	Friends of the MTN	
Pam Carver	Friends of the MTN	pcarver@dslextrreme.com
George MacDougall	CHP	gmacdougall@chp.ca.gov
Mina Layba	City of Thousand Oaks	mlayba@toaks.org
Minjile Mei	City of Santee	mmei@ci.santee.ca.us
Trev Holman	City of El Cajon	tholman@ci.el-cajon.ca.us
Duncan Hughes	City of San Diego	drhughes@sandiego.gov
Ron Miller	City of Escondido	romiller@ci.escondido.ca.us
Steve Chan	Kimley Harn & Assoc.	steve.chan@kimley-horn.com
Clyde Showalter	Palm Springs Desert	cshowalter@palmspringsusa.com
Maurice Kavfman	City of Emeryville	mkavfman@emeryville.ca.us (510) 596-4334
Walt Huffman	City of San Diego	whuffman@sandiego.gov

MINUTES

Adoption of February 15, 2007 CTCDC meeting minutes.

Motion: Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to adopt the minutes of February 15, 2007 CTCDC meeting held in Oakland, California. Motion carried 7-1 (Hamid Bahadori abstained because he did not attend the meeting).

Membership

Chairman Mansourian introduced new members, Lujanna Lopez representing CHP, Wayne Henley, Caltrans, and Kim Marianne, Alternate, Southern Auto Club. Deborah Wong, Alternate Member, Auto Club Northern California, acted as a voting member since Merry Banks was leaving the meeting early due to another assignment.

Public Comments:

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments on any items not appearing on the agenda.

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans commented that the proposed 2008 MUTCD is under review and the NTCUD is making comments at the same time Caltrans is submitting their comments. He asked whether local agencies are also reviewing the draft.

John Fisher stated that he represents the ITE, and there are 8 members, making up 70%, which are from local agencies. They comment on behalf of all the local agencies. Secondly, it is premature to comment at this time. When FHWA issues the rule-making and asks for comments, then it is the appropriate time for local agencies to comment.

There were no other public comments.

Chairman Mansourian outlined the procedures for the meeting. He stated that when an item comes for hearing, he would ask the sponsor to provide the background and then ask the Committee members if they have any questions for the presenter. Then he will open up for public comments. After public comments are closed, the item will be brought back to Committee members for discussion and deliberation. Once the public comments are closed, there will be no comments from the public unless the Committee member wants to ask questions for clarification.

O6-8 FHWA's Interim Approval for Optional Use of Flashing Yellow Arrow (FYA)

Chairman Mansourian stated that he asked to place this item on the agenda because during the previous meetings, the Committee made recommendations to Caltrans to request blanket approval from FHWA for all the local agencies in California. Also, during those meetings, Ahmad Rasetgarpour, Caltrans, raised some safety concerns related to the guidelines issued by FHWA. During the first meeting held in October of 2006, Caltrans' voting member went along with the Committee and recommended seeking blanket approval from FHWA. Later however, Caltrans' voting member agreed with Ahmad's concerns, and they wrote a letter to the Committee (a copy is included in the agenda packet). Basically, Caltrans stated they will not seek blanket approval unless the Committee considers the safety concerns raised by Ahmad.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the Committee has a few options, either to do nothing, or every agency approach the Committee for approval or include Caltrans' concerns with FHWA guidelines.

Hamid Bahadori stated that there are two local agencies presently using FYA, which has been approved by FHWA, as well as by this Committee. He asked when they would submit a report to the Committee.

Chairman Mansourian stated that according to FHWA guidelines, the agencies receiving IA's approval are not required to submit further data. However the agencies are encouraged to share their experience with the devices and if improvement is warranted that could be incorporated in the final policy.

Jacob asked that if a local agency uses Caltrans amended guidelines, would that create a FHWA funding problem?

There was a comment that since the Caltrans recommendations are enhancing FHWA guidelines and not deviating from the FHWA guidance, there should not be a funding issue.

Ed von Borstel stated that the devices have been tested nationwide and there was no reported problem, and FHWA has issued Interim Approval based on experiment conducted by different agencies. He stated that he shares the concerns raised by Caltrans, however there is no problem indicated by any agency that has used the FYA and presently using FYA.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he supports one standard for the whole state and that uniformity is the key for motorists.

John Fisher stated that the Caltrans letter has left some unanswered questions. For one, there are two local agencies who received approval from this Committee, and they are using devices based on FHWA guidelines. Secondly, when the 2009 MUTCD is published with the same guidelines as listed in the IA's, then California will not be in compliance. Thirdly, conclusions should be based on evidence. Fisher fully shared the safety concerns raised by Caltrans. However, there were numerous locations tested under the FHWA process, and none of the locations indicated that the operation of FYA was misinterpreted by motorists. He stated that Caltrans should reconsider their concerns and resolve this issue.

Wayne Henley stated that he supports similar standards for Caltrans and local agencies, and there is a need to work on this to eliminate the differences.

Lujuanna Lopez stated that if there are different operational methods for the same device, then the motorist would be confused. She supported one standard for the FYA.

Deborah Wong stated that the experiment could be conducted by using different applications for a new device. However, the final standard should be one for one agency or another.

Chairman Mansourian stated that he does not support two different intersections having different operations for the same device. It will be confusing to the motoring public. Chairman Mansourian stated that he would ask for public comments, however he would like to ask Caltrans, especially Ahmad to address three questions outlined by John Fisher as follows:

What is the advice to ongoing experiments in the City of Fullerton and City of Pasadena?

Any evidence showing that FHWA guidelines have created safety concerns?

What will happen in 2009, when the MUTCD is published with the same standards as listed in the IA and CA is different? Where would be the compliance?

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public hearing.

Ron Miller, City of Escondido, shared one incident with Committee members caused by the yellow solid ball. He added that the drivers are very relaxed and they do not pay attention to the traffic rules. He stated that he has concerns with liability by allowing the use of FYA with the guidelines issued by the FHWA, the agency who is using this device putting their selves in a liability situation.

Chairman Mansourian responded that if an agency is getting approval by using the process outlined in the CA MUTCD, then they are not exposed to the liability.

Zoubir Ouadah, City of Poway, stated that he agreed with John Fisher's earlier comments that there is no evidence produced by Caltrans that the motorist has misinterpreted the device. He agreed with having one standard and suggested the Committee not to recommend different standards for Caltrans and local agencies.

Ahmad Rastegarour, Caltrans, stated that as mentioned by John Fisher, there might not be any problems observed on locations where the device has been tested, however, there is a potential for the motorist to misjudge the operation. Caltrans is proposing extra features to eliminate any confusion motorists may have with the FHWA guidelines.

Johnny Bhullar commented that an IA as issued by the FHWA does not require more data from the agency that receives approval. The agency must inform the state about the location. The final language may be changed based on the comments received by the FHWA, however, it is not known until the final ruling. He added that he liked the idea proposed by the Chairman to set up a Subcommittee to sort out the differences and recommend a final product to the CTCDC for the next meeting.

John Fisher asked Johnny Bhullar whether he could add more on the topic of FYA.

Johnny Bhullar stated that when an IA is issued by the FHWA, that IA will be discussed by the Committee as soon as possible, and if the Committee agrees with the concept, they would ask Caltrans to apply for a blanket approval from FHWA for all the CA agencies.

John Fisher stated that if Caltrans is not asking for blanket approval for the FYA, then each agency who would like to use FYA could ask for approval from the Committee. It is up to the Committee if they would impose additional features on the agency during the approval process.

Johnny Bhullar stated that is a correct statement.

Hamid Bahadori stated that both Fullerton and Pasadena would submit data on the experiment if the Committee asked for it.

John Fisher stated that the point he want to get across is that there is ongoing use of the device in three different cities, and the information from those three cities would be helpful to the Committee to make a final decision.

Zoubir Ouadah talked about the procedure to get approval from FHWA on IA's. FHWA gave approval to a requesting agency and advised them to inform their state. He asked if the agency is required to ask for approval from this Committee?

Chairman Mansourian stated that the California Vehicle Code, Section 21400, states the following:

21400. The Department of Transportation shall, after consultation with local agencies and public hearings, adopt rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications **for all official traffic control devices** placed pursuant to this code, including, but not limited to, stop signs, yield right-of-way signs, speed restriction signs, railroad warning approach signs, street name signs, lines and markings on the roadway, and stock crossing signs placed pursuant to Section 21364.

The Department of Transportation shall, after notice and public hearing, determine and publicize the specifications for uniform types of warning signs, lights, and devices to be placed upon a highway by any person engaged in performing work which interferes with or endangers the safe movement of traffic upon that highway.

Only those signs, lights, and devices as are provided for in this section shall be placed upon a highway to warn traffic of work which is being performed on the highway.

Any control devices or markings installed upon traffic barriers on or after January 1, 1984, shall conform to the uniform standards and specifications required by this section.

What is an Official Traffic Control Device:

CVC 440. An "official traffic control device" is any sign, signal, marking, or device, consistent with Section 21400, placed or erected by authority of a public body or official having jurisdiction, for the purpose of regulating, warning, or guiding traffic, but does not include islands, curbs, traffic barriers, speed humps, speed bumps, or other roadway design features.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) is the vehicle by which Caltrans fulfills its obligation to consult with local agencies and the public before adopting rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications for all official traffic control devices used in California.

Trev Holman asked the Committee that they received approval from the FHWA to use FYA and did not seek the approval from this Committee. Then they installed another one. Since, the City never asked for approval from the Committee, what should the City do now to fulfill Committee requirements?

Chairman Mansourian stated that the FHWA approval process is fine, however, the local agencies in CA are required the seek approval from the CTCDC on new devices.

Trev Holman stated that he supports one standard in CA for the FYA.

Johnny Bhullar stated the IA is not a final standard. The FHWA believes that they have enough support to issue interim guidelines on a device based on the data collected from various experiments. The final language could be different based on further comments received by the FHWA. He further added that on experimental approval process, the FHWA is silent. However on IAs, FHWA tells the jurisdictions that they “shall” inform the state about the location of the device being used.

There were no other comments. Chairman Mansourian closed the public hearing and brought the item back to the Committee.

Hamid Bahadori added that wherever the MUTCD, CA MUTCD and CVC differ, the CVC supersedes both the MUTCD and CA MUTCD. The law is very clear which devices could be used in CA according to the CVC 21400. Secondly, the CTCDC is represented by different organizations, and when a member votes on a particular item, his/her vote represents the organization which he/she is representing.

Chairman Mansourian stated that from the discussion he observed, that a Subcommittee should address this issue and the Subcommittee submits their recommendation so that this item can be decided during the next CTCDC meeting. Chairman Mansourian asked the members if they agreed to have a Subcommittee sort out the concerns raised by Caltrans. The Committee members agreed.

Chairman Mansourian formed the Subcommittee and nominated the following members:

Ahmad Rastegarpour – Caltrans
Johnny Bhullar - Caltrans
Hamid Bahadori – Southern Auto Club
John Fisher – DOT LA City
Jacob Babico – San Bernardino County
Representative from the City of Fullerton and Pasadena
Trev Holman – El Cajon
Matt Schmitz - FHWA

Johnny Bhullar of Caltrans will chair the Subcommittee and they will discuss the issue raised by Ahmad Rastegarpour of Caltrans and John Fisher during the earlier discussion.

John Fisher stated that if the experiment in three cities indicates that there are no safety problems and the devices have not created any confusion or misinterpretation by the motorists, then Caltrans’ concerns are without any evidence, and FHWA guidelines should be considered adequate for the FYA.

Chairman Mansourian stated that is the work of the Subcommittee and the final recommendation should be placed on the agenda for the full Committee’s action during the next meeting.

Action: Items was deferred for the next meeting

06-12 No Parking Signs

Chairman Mansourian stated that during the last meeting John Fisher, Subcommittee's chairman, updated the progress on "No Parking" signs and stated that during the June meeting the Subcommittee will submit their final proposal on this item. Chairman Mansourian stated that the City/County of San Francisco brought this item to the Committee's attention. The City/County of San Francisco submitted a letter to Caltrans indicating that they have numerous No Parking signs, which are not in compliance with the MUTCD or CA MUTCD, and they need help from the CTCDC and Caltrans to make those signs in compliance with the CA MUTCD. Chairman Mansourian appreciated the work done by the Subcommittee and he especially thanked John Fisher for submitting an outstanding report and proposal for the full Committees' consideration. Chairman Mansourian asked John Fisher to share the final recommendation with the Committee and audience.

John Fisher stated that in August 2006, the City/County of San Francisco sent a letter dated August 14, 2006 to Caltrans regarding their use of non-standard signs. This matter was placed on the agenda of the October 26, 2006 meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC). The letter transmitted attached photos of 53 regulatory, warning and guide signs with non-standard messages and formats intended to address special situations. The CTCDC did not wish to investigate the feasibility of using other methods or other traffic control devices to address the special situations. However, it was noted that the photos included 17 parking-related signs where the restrictions and authorized in the Vehicle Code but where no corresponding standards exist in the California MUTCD.

John Fisher stated that Chairman Mansourian recognized a need to examine the parking signs and appointed member John E. Fisher, City of Los Angeles, to the head a task force to address the need for uniform parking signs. He appointed to this task force: Jacob Babico, San Bernardino County (member), Michael Robinson, San Diego County, Richard Olea, City of San Francisco, Howard Chan, City of Sacramento, and Ramon Gibbons, City of Sacramento.

John Fisher stated that the Task Force coordinated these efforts primarily through e-mail. The Task Force work commenced by examining the Vehicle Code to identify special parking zones that public agencies may authorize. Then the corresponding signs in the California MUTCD were checked and it was discovered that many types of zones were not shown. They are summarized in Table 1. The MUTCD's of other large states were research to see if they could provide guidance. Those states included New York, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Virginia, District of Columbia, Massachusetts and Texas. Surprisingly, no guidance was found. Thus, the Subcommittee proceeded to develop new parking related signs, based on long-standard California principles of format, color, Vehicle Code text and adopted symbols. California uses a variety of colored curb zones to delineate special parking zones. The practice is more extensive in California than in any other state, as the practice was developed in California. Accordingly a primary guiding principle in developing new special parking-related signs was to use sign colors that reflect the associated colored curb zones. For example, time limit parking, which can be shown by a green curb, can also be shown by a green-and-white sign, such as the R32(CA). Another example is "no stopping" which can be shown by red curb or by a red-and-white sign, such as the R26(S)(CA). The same concept applies to disabled parking with blue curb and blue-and-white signs, such as the R99(CA). Following this pattern, a commercial loading zone, which can be marked by yellow curb, is proposed to have a sign with the corresponding colors of black text on a yellow background. Likewise, those passenger loading and vehicle stand zones, which can be marked by white curb, are proposed to have signs with the corresponding colors of black text on a white background. It was also noted that there are conflicting sign formats when Figures 2B-16 and 2B-16(CA) are compared. In the interest of uniformity and long-standing California practice, the inferior formats are proposed for deletion and are shown with a

blue X across them. Finally, the text of Sections 2B.39 and 2B.40 was reviewed based on the proposed revised

John Fisher stated that the text of Sections 2B.39 and 2B.40 were reviewed based on the proposed Figures 2B-16, 2B-16(CA) and 2B-17. Based on this review, new text is proposed and other text is proposed for revision. Due to the number of new signs being added, it was determined that it would be more helpful to users to refer them to the applicable sections of the Vehicle Code, rather than provide text for every parking-related sign.

John further stated that in presenting these recommendations to the Committee, it should be noted that there was general consensus. However, there were some differences of opinion on the formats on some of the signs. In those cases where not all members of the Task Force could agree, the Chair has presented his recommendation.

John Fisher stated that the Subcommittee is asking Caltrans to adopt the following:

- Caltrans adopt the enclosed revisions to Figures 2B-16, 2B-16(CA) and 2B-17 of the California MUTCD, in order to both show the sign formats for special parking and loading signs, and to minimize redundant conflicting formats.
- Caltrans assign revised and new sign numbers to reflect the revisions to Figures 2B-16, 2B-16(CA) and 2B-17.
- Caltrans adopt the enclosed text revisions to Sections 2B.39 and 2B.40 of the California MUTCD in order to reflect the sign format revisions and simplify the text.
- Caltrans issue interim guidelines for the revised figures and text described above, so that public agencies in California may use these signs as soon as possible.

John Fisher suggested that the future update of the CA MUTCD should reflect these signs and text.

Chairman Mansourian thanked the Subcommittee and asked the Committee members if they have any questions for John Fisher.

Jacob Babico stated that the “No Parking” sign for bus stops shows one arrow, and asked if it would be possible to allow two-way arrows if warranted. He also asked if there is any requirement for the curb color?

John Fisher stated that the two-way arrow requirement is covered in the text and the type of color curb for different parking zones is mentioned in the CVC.

Hamid Bahadori stated that Figure 2B-16 shows “School Bus Zone” with two ways arrow, he believes that sign will not stop drivers from parking there. Because most drivers will not think that there is a parking prohibition. The sign should say, “School Bus Zone No Parking” or “School Bus Only” with arrows.

John Fisher responded no, the sign will work fine and people will understand that this is a “School Bus Zone” and they do not park there.

Hamid stated that this would cause problems, because the average motorist will not understand a message such as School Bus Zone. The motorist will say, since there is no sign prohibiting parking, I can park

there. He suggested that if the word “Zone” is replaced with word “Only”, then the sign serves the purpose and motorists will not park in a school bus zone, taxicab zone, or tour bus zone.

John Fisher stated that the sign serves the purpose such as Taxicab Zone, it means that it is a taxicab zone only, and other vehicle does not belong there.

Wayne Henley stated that his staff was very appreciative of the work accomplished by the Subcommittee.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Amanuel Haile from Marin County stated that the sign with “Taxicab Zone” with two-way arrow would be enforceable and advise the motorist they do not belong there.

Johnny Bhullar stated that Caltrans does not use that many No Parking signs as compare to the local agencies. That was may be one of the reasons that these signs were not included in the manual to cover all the situations. He thanked Subcommittee for the through work.

Duncan Hughes, City of San Diego, commented that symbols signs shown in Figure 2B-16 (CA) would not be easily readable and suggested not to adopt.

John Fisher responded that there is no experimentation conducted with the symbol sign, however, the Subcommittee member believes that symbol signs in other situations are preferred, therefore, these signs were included. The direction of the vehicle is indicated by red lights (back stop lights).

Johnny Bhullar stated that if there is a symbol available in the MUTCD and if that symbol is used with a different sign, it is acceptable by the FHWA and not considered a violation of the symbol.

There were no other public comments.

Chairman Mansourian stated there are four recommendations by the Subcommittee. He asked the Committee members if they had further comments.

Deborah Wong suggested replacing the word “Zone” with “Only” so it would be clearer to motorists.

Hamid Bahadori suggested that using the word “Only” would be clearer to the motorist and will remind them that they do not park there.

Chairman Mansourian asked John Fisher if he is agreed to the suggestion to replacing word “Zone” with “Only”.

John Fisher stated that if the Committee does not feel comfortable with the word “Zone”, then the word “Zone” be replaced with “Only” instead of adding another line which says, “Zone Only”.

The Committee agreed to replace the word “Zone” with “Only” from the ‘School Bus, Taxicab, Tour Bus, and from the same signs shown as a symbol messages.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommends that Caltrans adopt the sign as amended with the proposed text for the signs and issue an interim policy so that agencies can use these signs to bring non-compliance signs up to standards.

Morton carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed and Caltrans will inform the Committee when the policy is posted on the CA MUTCD website.

Note: The proposed sign “Figures and Text” is attached as an “Appendix A-Item 06-12.”

07-11 Veterans National Cemetery Signs

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item “Veterans National Cemetery” Sign.

Wayne Henley stated that the United States Congress authorized the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish eight (8) national cemeteries in California. Thus far, seven (7) national cemeteries have been established in California. They are the Sacramento Valley VA, Riverside, San Joaquin Valley, Fort Rosecrans, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Golden Gate National Cemetery.

Wayne Henley added that the “Sacramento Valley VA National Cemetery”, located 1.3 miles east of Interstate 80, requested a sign to be installed at Midway Road exit in Solano County between the cities of Dixon and Vacaville. The Department, upon request from the Federal Department of Veterans Administration, will install one sign in each direction of travel from the nearest State highway. Districts may order and install new or replacement signs or may have the signs ordered and installed by others under an encroachment permit.

Wayne Henley requested the Committee to recommend that Caltrans adopt this sign as included in the agenda packet.

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee members if they have any comments.

John Fisher stated that the VA (Veterans Affairs) is not needed on the sign since the National Cemetery is known as Veterans Affairs. He cited the example of Arlington National Cemetery.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the request came as was authorized by the United States of Congress to the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish 8 National Cemeteries in CA.

There were no other comments from Committee members.

Chairman Mansourian opened for public hearing.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommends adopting the sign as shown in the agenda packet.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed.

07-12 Amendment to CA MUTCD Section 4E.08 Pedestrian Detectors

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley address agenda item 07-12.

Wayne Henley stated that the Caltrans standard practice is to install the Pedestrian Detectors (Pedestrians Push Buttons) at 1.0 meter (3.3 Ft) mounting height above pavement/sidewalk. California MUTCD recommends an approximate 1.1 meter (3.5 Ft) above the sidewalk. Also, the California proposed standard is “shall” while MUTCD has “should” conditions.

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee members if they have any questions for Wayne Henley.

There were none.

Chairman Mansourian opened public hearing.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the revised standard was in the State’s Traffic Manual and it is consistent with the State of Architect requirements. It also satisfies the ADA requirements. It was an oversight error while the CA MUTCD was adopted in California.

There were no other comments from public.

Chairman Mansourian opened for discussion amongst the Committee members.

John Fisher stated that if the national manual has 1.1 meter and California is adopting 1.0 meter, it would not be in compliance with MUTCD.

Johnny Bhullar stated that CA standards are pre dated to the ADA laws. During the process of adopting the CA MUTCD, it was an oversight and now Caltrans is proposing to be consistent with the previous standards. Also MUTCD language has guidance, not standards, and CA is adopting standards.

Hamid Bahadori stated that it would be difficult to achieve an exact 1.0 meter above the sidewalk in different field conditions. He recommended that the word “approximate” is necessary and suggested to amending approximate 1.0 meter as guidance.

Jacob Babico and John Fisher agreed with Hamid’s comments to changing it to the guidance, says approximate 1.0 meter above the sidewalk should be used.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommends that Caltrans adopt the following language under Section 4E.08 Pedestrian Detectors as guidance:

A mounting height of approximately 1.0-m (3.3 ft) above the sidewalk should be used for pedestrian push-button detectors.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed.

07-13 Experimental Process With New Traffic Control Devices

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item 07-13.

Wayne Henley stated that the flow chart shown in the agenda packet outlines the process to request experiment with new traffic control devices and simplifies the process for the prerequisite.

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee members if they have questions on this item.

John Fisher asked to go over the chart in regards to an agency asking for approval from CTCDC and CTCDC asking the agency to also seek approval from the FHWA.

Devinder Singh stated that since he worked on the flow chart he would answer John's question. Devinder pointed out that the first column on the right-hand side in the chart states, "may ask to receive approval from FHWA first" or alternatively "would ask to receive approval from the FHWA first if it would conflict with standards". This column addresses the FHWA approval requirements. Devinder added that the column shows two options, and the bottom language is suggested by John Fisher. The reason both is shown is so the Committee members can give their opinion.

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny Bhullar if he has any comments on the flow chart.

Johnny pointed out the arrow above the last diamond shape column is not needed, it may be an error. He suggested keeping the language in the right column as suggested by John Fisher.

Hamid Bahadori asked Johnny Bhullar that some agencies are going directly to FHWA to seek Interim Approval. What is your opinion on that?

Johnny Bhullar stated that in California the standards for the traffic control devices are in CA MUTCD. Agencies should not follow the MUTCD and if they go directly to the FHWA for IA or experimental request, then they must inform to this Committee because of the California law.

Johnny Bhullar further stated that recently FHWA has provided clarification on "shall" and "should" requirement. The States Manuals or Supplements are required be in "substantial conformance" with the National MUTCD as approved by the FHWA Division Administrator. The "substantial conformance" means that the State MUTCD or Supplement shall conform as a minimum to the standard statements included in the National MUTCD. Standard statements in the MUTCD describe required practices and are indicated by the term "shall." The FHWA also define "substantial conformance" to mean that the guidance statements contained in the National MUTCD also are expected to be in the State Manual or supplement unless the reason for not including it is satisfactorily explained based on engineering judgment or a documented engineering study. Guidance statements in the MUTCD describe recommended practices and are indicated by the term "should." Under the proposed definition, a State Manual or Supplement could not be less prescriptive than the MUTCD but it could be more prescriptive; meaning, for example, that a guidance or "should" statement in the National MUTCD could not be an option in the State Manual, but that it could be a standard or "shall" statement. The Division Administrator and the FHWA Associate Administrator of the Federal Lands Highway Program have the flexibility to determine on a case-by-case basis the degree of variation allowed.

Johnny Bhullar stated that above clarification is proposed to include in the future update of the national MUTCDD.

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny to share that information with Committee members during the future meetings.

Zubir Ouadah stated that he agreed with earlier comments that in California only one document is applicable and that is a CA MUTCD. He commented that when a local agency requests for experimentation with a new traffic control device, they should only come to this Committee, so why would they need approval from FHWA?

John Fisher stated that if the proposal is deviating from MUTCD standards or it conflict with standards, then this Committee will ask the requesting agency to seek approval from the FHWA before experimenting with that device.

Zubir Ouadah asked if there is a need to get FHWA involvement in the process, then the Committee should take that role.

Chairman Mansourian stated otherwise, because it is the responsibility of the local agency to seek approval from the FHWA. This Committee does not have resources to do this work.

Chairman Mansourian asked for other public comments.

There were none.

Chairman closed the public hearing and brought the item back for Committee discussion.

There were no other comments from the Committee members.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by John Fisher, recommends that the flow chart be adopted with two corrections:

First: remove the arrow between the last diamond and rectangle above that.

Second: delete the language from the first right-hand rectangle which says, "may ask to receive approval from FHWA first" and keep the language which states, "would ask to receive approval from the FHWA first if it would reduce the standards."

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item Completed.

07-14 Process to Adopt Interim Approvals in California Issued by the FHWA

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item 07-14.

Wayne Henley stated that this is another flow chart indicating the process to handle Interim Approvals issued by the FHWA in California.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

There were none.

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee members for comments.

There were none.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by John Fisher, recommend that Caltrans adopt the flow chart as included in the agenda packet.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed.

07-15 Proposal to Adopt “Safety Awareness Zone Next XX Miles”

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item “Safety Awareness Zone Next XX Miles.”

Wayne Henley stated that this is another sign created by the Legislatures and right now this is only for the Golden Gate Bridge. There are two options in the agenda and Caltrans wants the Committee’s guidance on this proposal.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that there is an existing sign, which is used for the safety corridor and suggested to use that sign for the Safety Awareness Zone instead of creating a new sign. Basically, the purpose of the sign is to warn motorists to drive safely.

Lujuanna Lopez stated that the safety corridors are developed by multiple agency involvement, such as Caltrans, CHP, and local municipality, and there is special grant to use on that particular safety corridor. The purpose of the safety corridor is to reduce the collisions on a segment of roadway and enforcement is involved. The Safety Awareness Zone looks like it could be created by a jurisdiction by adopting resolution with no other multiple agencies involved.

John Fisher stated that safety corridor and safety awareness zone both required education, enforcement and engineering measures to support the program. He suggested using the existing safety corridor sign to satisfy this legislation. The document included in the agenda packet does not say to develop a new sign. He suggested that existing sign is available and suggesting to use that. He further added that since this legislation is only for three years, why develop a permanent sign. This is a temporary condition and may require experimentation. He suggested that the Committee should not create a permanent sign for the temporary conditions.

Chairman Mansourian asked if the Committee could recommend a temporary sign?

John Fisher stated that is one of the options, however, the preference would be to use the existing safety corridor sign.

Hamid reiterates that he believes that there is existing program and the sign “Safety Corridor Drive Safely” could be used.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the safety corridor sign has been included in the CA MUTCD, Figure 2B-106 page 2B-91. The proposed sign is black on yellow and the existing safety corridor sign are black on white. The safety corridor signs are enforcement categories and the proposed sign is a warning sign.

There were no other public comments.

Chairman Mansourian brought discussion back to the Committee members.

Jacob Babico stated that he agreed with Hamid’s earlier comments to use existing sign instead of creating a new sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated that for the record these signs have absolutely no effect on the motoring public. This is what legislators are doing from the last few years, creating safety corridors and increasing law enforcement. The proposed sign as the second option included in the agenda packet is confusing, especially at the Golden Gate Bridge, because of the nature of traffic which is mixed with a lot of tourists from all over the world.

Lujuanna Lopez asked about the existing sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the existing sign is used in the safety corridor.

Chairman Mansourian commented that the Committee members' suggestion is that Caltrans consider the feasibility of using the existing safety corridor sign, and in the case the existing sign does not satisfy the legislation, then use option 1.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommends Caltrans to consider the feasibility of using the existing safety corridor sign. If that sign does not satisfy the legislation, then use option 1.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Update the Committee which sign is used.

07-16 SB 848, as Amended, Corbett. Vehicles: Engineering and Traffic Survey: Speed Trap

Chairman Mansourian gave a brief background about this item. He stated that on May 20, 2004 the CTCDC and Caltrans adopted a new language that is consistent with the Federal manual to establish speed limits on roadways. The policy allows when roadside development results in traffic conflicts and unusual conditions which are not readily apparent to drivers, as indicated in collision records, speed limits somewhat below the 85th percentile may be justified.

Chairman Mansourian stated that now many of the existing speed limits are no longer valid. The number of citations has been challenged in the courts. The local residents and politicians do not want to raise speed limits in their neighborhoods. He added that he has received a number of telephone calls from the public works directors after the adoption of the policy, claiming that they are required to update the engineering and traffic survey (E&TS) on the majority of roadways. Some of the local agencies and law enforcement agencies got together and proposed a legislation to eliminate the requirement of E&TS. Senator Ellen Corbett introduced a Senate Bill 848 in regards to this. The first proposal was to change the current laws and regulations regarding the establishment of speed limits and authorize the law enforcement officers in the state to establish speed limits by using a speed radar unit.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the Committee has a few options, to do nothing, or to reopen this issue for discussion, then analyze and convey the outcome from the discussion to Senator Ellen Corbett. If the Committee does nothing, there will be another legislation that will take away the technical requirement to establish a speed limit and it will be done by law enforcement with political involvement.

Chairman Mansourian further stated that this issue requires a lot of time and he suggested discussing it in a special workshop and then placing the outcome of the workshop on the CTCDC agenda for public hearing. The Committee should invite every local agency to participate or ask them to send their written comments regarding their concerns.

Hamid Bahadori commented that Chairman Mansourian has summarized the issue very well, however he would like to add his opinion on this issue. Hamid Bahadori added that as he earlier stated, that when a CTCDC member votes on an item it is not his individual vote, but rather it is a vote of their entire organization he represents. He stated that he was surprised to see that the CHP legislature group was also supporting SB848. Hamid Bahadori commented that he explained to the CHP that they have a voting member who sits in the CTCDC meetings and he has voted in favor of the accepted policy.

Hamid Bahadori stated that their club and their sister club of Northern CA worked very hard to put this bill off for the time being. However, they promised that the CTCDC would discuss this issue again and let them know the results of the discussion. As part of the discussion with the bill's author and supporters, it was agreed that by all parties that first part of the bill concerning the "rounding" issue when using an E&TS and 85th percentile speed will be completely eliminated, as this is a technical and engineering issue that needs to be further reviewed and discussed by the CTCDC where such discussion rightfully belongs. If there is a need for any modifications or clarifications to the current language in the CA MUTCD, the CTCDC as the primary author and custodian of that document needs to make them. The second part of SB848, concerning "speed trap", was also further modified, and an amended bill was submitted.

Hamid Bahadori further stated that even amended SB848 is still a serious threat to the speed trap law that has existed in some form for over 70 years, and both clubs have expressed their opposition to the bill as amended. SB848 is now a two-year bill, and no further action on it will be taken in this legislative cycle. Furthermore, the "speed trap" part of the bill does not need a review and discussion by the CTCDC in its

currently proposed language. Hamid Bahadori added that due to SB848 and concerns raised by some municipalities, he believes it is appropriate to have a comprehensive review of the “rounding” issue in the context of the overall rules and regulations regarding establishment of speed limits, and take necessary steps, as may be needed, to modify and/or further clarify the current language in the CA MUTCD about this issue.

Chairman Mansourian asked comments from other Committee members.

All the Committee members agreed to discuss in a workshop and also invite all the public agencies to participate in the discussion.

John Fisher stated that traffic engineers receive a number of complaints or requests to install new traffic signals, reduction of speed on certain roadways from politicians as well as from locals. It is difficult to make everybody happy, because sometimes locations do not meet requirements. If a speed limit is established below the 85th percentile and further reduced 5 mph based on the unusual conditions which are not readily apparent to drivers, as indicated in collision records, then the majority of the motorists will violate the speed limit because it is not posted as majorities of the drivers are driving. Traffic engineers need to look at the speed survey profile and see how many motorists will be illegal when you establish a speed limit 5 or 10 miles below the 85th percentile speed. This is not fair to the law obedient citizens. He suggested reviewing all the pros and cons before the Committee makes any decisions on this issue.

There were comments from the audience too, however no speaker came to the podium and the recording system was not able to record their comments clearly.

There was a comment from an audience (name unknown) who stated that a few meetings back this issue was discussed by the CTCDC on the request of the City of Santa Rosa. During that meeting, a few of the speakers requested to reopen this item and asked the Committee to reconsider guidelines which were in the State’s Traffic Manual. The Committee stated that the issue was discussed in detail during the MUTCD adoption process and also was discussed by the Subcommittee and no further discussion was needed and the adopted policy is the final policy.

Mina Layba stated that there is a need to involve cities and counties who implement the policies. The City of Thousand Oaks was declared the safest city recently. Public safety is not only about crime but includes issues related traffic and speed limits. She stated that the revenue generated by speeding violations is not significant enough to enhance their General Fund. Thus it is not the interest of the City to create speed traps. The City of Thousand Oaks uses revenues collected via traffic violations in grants to community organizations and non-profits. This revenue does not help the City financially. Since May of 2004, with the change to the CA MUTCD enforcement of speed limits has been more difficult. Judges are throwing out citations, because the new speed policy of rounding to the nearest 85th percentile is causing them to interpret a higher speed limit causing increased arterial speeds. Residents have strongly voiced their public safety concerns to City Council; and ad hoc pedestrian and traffic committee was even formed. In addition, she stated that there should be efforts to educate cities that there is a Committee who deals with these issues and that issues like this should be brought to the Committee, not to the legislature.

Ron Miller, City of Escondido, stated that he was looking for discussion on this item today and he will not be able to attend the workshop in Northern CA, however he will submit his written comments.

The conclusion was to discuss this item on October 10, 2007 in a workshop. Chairman Mansourian will send a letter to all the cities and counties asking for participation and in the event a city/county is not able to attend the workshop, they can submit their written comments.

There will be a workshop day prior to the CTCDC meeting to discuss this item.

07-17 Proposal for C17A (CA) ROAD WORK Plaque and Amendment to CA MUTCD Section 6F.104

Chairman Mansourian stepped out of the meeting and asked Vice Chairman Bahadori to run the meeting.

Vice Chairman Bahadori asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item 07-17.

Wayne Henley stated that the proposal is to create a new sign C17A (CA) and add text into the CA MUTCD Section 6F.104 under Option to allow reduction in speed limits during roadwork. To justify reduction in speed limits, the criteria is outlined under options and three individuals, the traffic engineer, construction engineer, and CHP should be in agreement.

Vice-Chairman Bahadori asked for comments from the Committee members.

John Fisher stated that he does not have a problem with the sign, however he has a comment on the text. The text is written only for State Highways. If a county road has a high-speed roadway then this policy should be applicable on county roads too. This type of sign is very useful on high-speed county roads. The Committee spent numerous time getting away from saying state highway or local roads in the CA MUTCD. It should be more generic so that it can be applicable on high-speed roads. John asked if the C17 (CA) will be deleted.

Wayne Henley responded no.

Jacob Babico asked if the same code would be used for the proposed sign and current sign C17 (CA)?

Wayne Henley responded no, the existing sign code is C17 (CA) and the proposed sign is C17A (CA).

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the existing sign C17 (CA) is one sign with Road Work and the speed limit embedded in the same panel. The proposed plaque C17A (CA) will be installed with the R2-1 speed limit sign. The C17A (CA) is a plaque and could be used in different sizes with R2-1 signs.

Jacob Babico asked is there an adopted sign that says "Road Work"? During the CA adoption process the "Construction Ahead" sign was deleted.

Johnny stated otherwise. He also stated that there is a proposal by the NTCUD to adopt a similar sign, however, the proposed sign is called "Work Zone" instead of "Road Work". Caltrans believes that "Road Work" is more appropriate. Caltrans suggested to NTCUD to consider "Road Work" instead of "Work Zone". Johnny also suggested changing the text under number three as follows:

1. The reduced speed limit may be ~~established~~ up to 10 miles per hour below the existing posted speed limit; and, ~~no~~ not less than 25 miles per hour.

Johnny further questioned the 400 feet number and asked the logic behind that.

David Royer, Consultant and Instructor for the Work Zone ITS Berkeley Program, stated that the proposed C17A (CA) sign should not be compared with the current approved sign C17 (CA). C17 (CA) is a very specific temporary sign used on local roads when workers are in endanger, and sign is covered or

removed when workers are not present. The proposed C17A (CA) sign is for the high-speed highways and it can be used for the safety of both motoring public and workers.

David Royer further stated that CVC 22362 states that C17 (CA) be installed within 400 feet of each end of such zone. He suggested that the proposed text should say that speed should not be reduced more than 10 mph. He suggested if the sign and policy is adopted it could be used on high-speed roadways, however, he prefers this sign to be used on multilane highways and freeways only. On urban state highways, the C17 (CA) could be used.

Hamid Bahadori asked about recommending the C17A (CA) only to be used on State Highways/freeways.

David responded that he prefers the C17 (CA) be used on local roads, not the proposed C17A (CA). The C17A (CA) can be used when motoring public and workers safety is in risk, however the C17 (CA) can be used only when workers are in endanger.

John Fisher asked David , earlier you stated that C17 (CA) be used in urban areas, and proposed C17A (CA) be used on high-speed highways/freeways?

David Royer responded that the proposed sign is different from the C17 (CA). The proposed sign policy is when workers and motoring public safety is at risk, then use this sign. However, the C17 (CA) is only for when workers are endangered and it is clearly outlined in the CVC.

John Fisher further asked that the proposed sign should be applicable only on state highways or other high-speed roads too.

David responded that the proposed sign can be used on high-speed roads, however, locals can use the C17 (CA).

Ron Miller, City of Poway, stated that the proposed C17A (CA) plaque is just like a school plaque and can be used on different signs.

Johnny Bhullar shared the Table 2C-4 with Committee members, which talks about the guidance for the advance placement of signs. Johnny stated that based on the table, the distance is much less compared to 400 feet mentioned in the text if the reduction is 10 mph.

Chairman Mansourian asked if there were any other comments from the public.

There were none.

Chairman Mansourian closed the public hearing and opened discussion to the Committee members.

John Fisher stated that the proposal needs some clarifications, such as the use of “Road Work” versus “Work Zone”. The language needs to be more generic, instead of specifying only for state highways, it should be for high speed roadways. Third; the text, the first paragraph is fine when it says C17A (CA) may be used if the following conditions are met. The conditions one through six need to be either “should” conditions or “shall” conditions. The text needs be follow the MUTCD format.

Hamid Bahadori questioned the use of “prima face” in number 5. He stated that prima face is a legal term and the word prima face speed is developed by the CVC.

Lujuanna Lopez asked whether the C17A (CA) would always be used with 50 MPH (R2-1) sign. She further suggested that the text might consider using the words “when workers are present”. She believes the sign should be used when workers are present and it will be removed when no worker is present.

Chairman Mansourian responded that speed limit number could vary, it will not be 50 mph for all conditions.

Chairman Mansourian stated that based on the discussion the item needs to be continued for the next meeting and asked Caltrans to address the questions raised by the Committee members. Chairman Mansourian summarized the comments raised by the Committee as follows:

- The use of “Road Work” versus “Work Zone.”
- The text should consider “when workers are present.”
- The text format as John Fisher suggested above.
- Review number 3, 4 and 5 condition as discussed above.
- The language should be more generic, which allows signs to be used on high-speed roadways.
- Why not make the existing sign C17 (CA) to be used on state highway? Consider changing the policy or CVC.

Action: Caltrans addresses above concerns and place this item for the next CTCDC meeting under action items.

07-18 Proposal to Amend “FWY Detour With Arrow” SC9 (CA) Sign and Adopt “Exit With Arrow Sign”

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item 07-18.

Wayne Henley stated that the proposal is to create two new construction signs one is Exit and second is Detour. Currently in the CA MUTCD there is an approved sign FWY DETOUR with Arrow SC9 (CA). It is very useful in a work zone that utilizes a detour. It has a removable arrow that can be mounted to point in any direction needed. It gives clear directions to the traffic as where to go. However, this sign is limited to the size of 36”X36”. Also, it won’t be fitting if the detour is not setup for Freeways.

Wayne stated that the proposal is to change the “FWY Detour With Arrow” [SC9 (CA)] Sign to “Detour with Arrow” sign. Two changes will be made. 1. Message modifications: The sign will have the message “DETOUR” with “FWY” as an option. 2. Size modification: The sign will be available in both 36”X36” and 48”X48”. Wayne stated that the second sign is EXIT sign and Caltrans contractors have been using a diamond shaped EXIT with Arrow sign with great success. It is very similar in specifications and usage with the DETOUR with arrow sign. It also has a removable arrow that can be mounted to point in any direction needed. It informs motorists of the direction to follow for a freeway exit inside of a work zone. It will only be available in the size of 48”X48”, This new policy will be added to Section 6F.28 of the CA MUTCD: “Guidance: The EXIT with Arrow (SC**(CA)) sign should be used to inform motorists of the direction to follow for a freeway exit within a work zone.” Wayne Henley stated that Caltrans has presently a 7 Billion Dollar of construction contracts, and that it will go up to 10 billions very soon. The proposed sign will provide some flexibility to use and asked the Committee to make recommendation to adopt these two signs officially.

Chairman Mansourian asked comments from the Committee.

There were none. Chairman asked public comments.

Johnny Bhullar stated that there are existing signs in rectangular shape with arrow and they can be easily modified to use. He mentioned that the rectangular construction signs have been adopted in the CA MUTCD which can be used.

David Royer stated that these signs are fabric signs and used in a temporary condition on a portable stand. The rectangular sign will be difficult to place on a temporary stand. He suggested that these signs are used by the contractors a lot in construction and suggested for approval.

There were no other comments from the public.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to the Committee members.

There were no comments from the Committee members.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommends that Caltrans adopt two signs as included in the agenda packet.

John Fisher made a friendly amendment saying that the arrow needs to be flared instead of pointed.

The amendment was acceptable to both Hamid Bahadori and Ed von Borstel.
Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item is completed.

6. Request for Experimentation

03-14 Numbering of Signalized Intersections

Chairman Mansourian stated that Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) obtained approval from the CTCDC on September 13, 2003 to conduct experiment with numbering on signalized intersection. CVAG has submitted two preliminary reports and a final report on the experiment. The numbering system was a successful concept, embraced by the affected jurisdictions and the tourist oriented organizations for which it was originally proposed. CVAG requested CTCDC to accept their conclusion and to allow continuous use of the numbering system in the Coachella Valley.

Chairman Mansourian stated that from the procedural point of view the request is to close the experiment and he asked Jacob Babico, sponsor of the experiment, if he would like to add any comments.

Jacob stated that the CVAG has submitted final reports to the Committee and their experience with the numbering system was very positively adopted by the locals, visitors, businesses, and they asking the Committee to allow their use continuously.

Devinder asked the Committee if this system would be limited to the CVAG only?

Hamid Bahadori stated that if the Committee is accepting their recommendations and allowing the use of devices continuously, then there must be a policy developed so that other jurisdictions can use it. There are locations in CA where this concept may be useful.

John Fisher stated that he is not satisfied with the data submitted by the CVAG. He has seen a number of letters supporting the concept, however, there is no objective data included in the report.

Chairman Mansourian asked if anyone from CVAG is present and would like to share their experience with the device.

Clyde Showalter, Director of Tourism, stated that the experiment was a successful concept for CVAG. The numbering system was placed on local maps to help traffic flow through the area, visitors find the right place to go for dining, hotels. Overall the system is very efficient. Route 111 is a winding road traversing through seven different communities, and it is difficult for visitors to identify different communities. The numbering system has helped the visitor, new people moving in the area. They receive a package which identifies schools, hospitals and grocery stores. The local residents also get help from the system and there were a number of letters and newspaper articles submitted to the Committee in support of the system. He asked if there were any questions for him.

John Fisher asked whether there were any surveys conducted asking the visitors or others if the numbering system was helpful in reaching their destination.

Clyde Showalter stated that he believed no survey was conducted, however, all the hotels use the maps which have the numbering system.

There were no other comments from the public.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to Committee members.

Lujuanna Lopez stated that the maps with numbering system might be helpful to find a location.

Chairman Mansourian stated that there are two options. First, that the Committee consider the experiment successful based on the data submitted by CVAG and to start developing a policy. Second, ask CVAG to submit specific data.

Hamid Bahadori stated that if the Committee asked for more data, it should be spelled out what the Committee is asking for.

Deborah Wong stated that if the Committee accepts the experiment, they could allow application of the numbering system very narrowly at the beginning then expand it as more experience is gained from different jurisdictions.

John Fisher stated that his assessment is that the CVAG probably will not to go back and collect more specific data, and the Committee needs to reach a conclusion. This is a learning process and in the future, the Committee should be more specific about what they are looking for from the experiment.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, the Committee accepted the final report and will allow the continuous use of the devices and ask Caltrans to develop a draft policy to indicate use of the devices and bring it back for Committee review and recommendations.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will inform the Committee on the progress on the policy.

00-3 Trucks Minimize Engine Brake Noise

Chairman Mansourain stated that Caltrans is asking to put this item to a close, and asked Wayne Henley to address this item.

Wayne Henley stated these signs were installed under experimentation and the data received from the experimenting agency was very inclusive. Caltrans surveyed among the Caltrans districts and some of them said it is not a good idea and others said it is useful. Caltrans asked for a legal opinion and legal suggested it is not a good idea to place this sign. Caltrans need Committee guidance on this pending item.

Chairman asked for comments from the Committee members.

Jacob Babico stated that the County of San Bernardino has used these sign in desert areas since people were complaining about the noise. The signs were used as black on white. However, it was found out that there is no effect of the signs to reduce noise and the County requested to remove these signs.

Chairman Mansourian stated that seven years ago the City of Auburn received approval for the experiment, however, data submitted by them was very brief and the Committee was not able to make a decision on the sign. The Committee tabled this item to get more data, however, no agency came forward to conduct experimentation and collect data. Since no agency is willing to do further studies, the item will be considered closed.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Lujuanna Lopez, recommends to discontinuing the experiment and ask jurisdictions to restore the locations back to original conditions by removing the experimental devices.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item completed.

07-19 Wildlife Corridor Signage

Chairman Mansourian asked Jacob Babico to give an overview of the wildlife experiment request.

Jacob Babico stated that Friends of the Mountain INC., community cares about the wildlife and other animals in the mountainous terrain of San Bernardino County. Yacapia community had already installed signs which are unofficial. Jacob invited Carol Pedder to address the Committee.

Carol Pedder, President of Friends of the Mountain INC., stated that they believe there is a need to improve traffic safety due to increased traffic, immense population growth, and urbanization of once wild areas. The proposal is to install signs indicating Wildlife Corridors in San Bernardino County. Carol Pedder stated that statistics from the National Academies Transportation Research Board, over the past decade, animal-related vehicle crashes has claimed 1, 353 human lives costing the nation well over \$1 billion in losses. The CDC report covering 2001-02 estimates that 200 human deaths occurred, and 26,647 motor vehicle occupants were treated for non-fatal injuries in U.S. hospital emergency departments all as a result of collisions with wild animals or by people trying to avoid those animals.

Carol Pedder presented a package to the Committee members containing the facts from many different sources showing the need for wildlife corridor signs. The package contains the maps showing the wildlife corridors.

Carol Pedder added that both Yacapia and Calimesa areas believe that wildlife and its habitat are a natural and important part of urban neighborhoods and can co-exist in harmony. Both communities have endorsed and are implementing the wildlife corridor sign program by education and bringing awareness to the public. This program takes a proactive approach to integrate wildlife into our urban sprawl with the least amount of impact to either. Carol stated that wildlife corridor maps were consulted in conjunction with current city maps, and then locations were chosen for sign placement.

Carol Pedder stated that this is the first program endorsed, recommended, and embraced by the Department of Fish and Game as a way to keep the motoring public and wildlife safe by educating first and providing approved information to the public. The program does not intend to interfere with the work of the Fish and Game Department. Instead, it is intended to work with the Department to benefit the wildlife in the areas. Carol asked the Committee members if they had questions for her.

Hamid Bahadori stated that there are existing signs available and suggested to use those signs with a supplement plate indicating next XX miles. He commented how the new signs will improve the awareness of drivers compared to the existing signs. He stated that the motoring public does not care if they are encountering a deer, cattle, lion or any other animal. The signs are for their awareness and to warn them that they need to be more careful for the next so many miles because they might encounter wild animals.

Carol Pedder asked what existing signs are available.

Hamid Bahadori discussed the deer crossing sign and the bear with a baby bear sign.

Jacob Babico stated that he initiated a request to install deer crossing signs, however, Fish and Game Department stated that there is no pattern for deer crossings. Furthermore, Fish and Game did identify the mountain lion and coyote crossing. He stated that he could get locations from the Fish and Game Department for the mountain lion and coyote crossings.

Hamid Bahadori stated that by using different animals on the sign would not improve traffic safety or make the driver more aware.

John Fisher stated that Hamid Bahadori raised a good point and Jacob Babico too. He added that he agreed with the concept to warn the motorist that they need to be aware of the presence of wildlife animals. However, the sign presented by Carol Pedder is good for hikers, and that a driver could not read the message, that it is too wordy with too much information.

Carol Pedder stated that she agreed and sign could be made simpler.

Chairman Mansourian stated that there are other signs available, and in lieu of available signs, questioned if Carol would prefer to use the proposed sign.

Carol Pedder stated that they really want to use the word Wildlife.

Lujuanna Lopez stated that she has been with the CTCDC on and off since 1990, and there is always the opportunity to revise or modify signs. She is very familiar with the area and she supports the experiment with the proposed sign. She added that the wildlife message will be different from the bear and deer crossing signs.

Wayne Henley asked Carol Pedder if they have any statistics on how many animals are injured or killed by the motorists in San Bernardino County.

Carol Pedder responded no. They do not have numbers except the national data which was shared earlier.

John Fisher stated that he might support the request if the message is simpler. If the message had only the symbol and Wildlife corridor, then he will support the proposal.

Hamid Bahadori asked Jacob Babico if the County has tried existing signs and they were not effective. If that was the case, the new sign could be tested, however, the County has not tried the exiting signs.

Jacob Babico stated that he approached the Fish & Game Department, and they have told him that there were no deer-crossing patterns, therefore signs could not be installed. Coyote crossings could be identified by pattern. Jacob Babico further added that he agrees with John Fisher's comment that the sign needs to be simplified.

Lujuanna Lopez stated that the wildlife sign is a different message compared to the deer and bear crossing signs.

Chairman Mansourian stated that based on the discussion, he would ask Jacob Babico to consider experiment by using existing signs available and the proposed sign, then, submit data to the Committee identifying which sign is more effective and easy to understand by motorists.

Jacob stated that he could not install deer crossing signs because Fish & Game Department does not support it.

Chairman Mansourian stated that you could install deer crossing signs, the purpose of going through Fish & Game is identifying the crossing trail. Fish & Game does not dictate whether you can install sign are not, agencies check with them to find the right crossing location.

Chairman Mansourian asked Carol Pedder if she is fine with using less a crowded sign as suggested by John Fisher. The suggested sign by John Fisher is to use the symbol with three animals and the text message "Wildlife Corridor".

Carol Pedder responded it is acceptable.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, authorizing the experimentation by using the sign with three animals and with text message "Wildlife Corridor". Experiment will also use the current approved sign with the proposed sign and evaluate to determine which sign is more effective and easy to understand by motorists.

Chairman Mansourian asked for discussion on the motion.

John Fisher asked what type of data would be provided to the Committee. He stated that the experiment should provide a survey to determine which sign is effective and easy to understand by motorists.

Jacob Babico stated that Carol Pedder's group would conduct the study.

John Fisher stated that it is the responsibility of a local agency to oversee the study and submit a final report to the Committee. Who collect the data does not matter as long as the agency having jurisdiction on the roadway is involved and data is collected under their supervision.

Jacob stated that Carol Pedders' group will work as a consultant to the County and the County will submit interim reports and a final report to the Committee after 3 years of the devices being placed in the field.

Hamid Bahadori stated that for the record he is against the experiment because the County has not used the current tools available to see if the problem is resolved. The experiment is only conducted with different devices, if the existing signs or available tools do not work. County has not done that process, therefore he will be voting against the experiment.

There were no other comments.

Motion carried 7-1 (Hamid Bahadori voted against the experiment request).

Action: Item approved for experimentation.

07-20 Request for Permission to Experiment with “Hawk” Traffic Control Devices

Chairman Mansourian stated that the next item is to experiment request with “Hawk” traffic control devices and the request is submitted by the City of Emeryville. He asked Ed von Borstel, sponsor, to address the item.

Ed von Borstel stated that the City of Emeryville proposed experimentation with HAWK beacon signals to enhance pedestrian/bicycle crossing. He asked Steve Chan, City of Emeryville, to share their proposal with the Committee and with audiences.

Steve Chan stated that the City of Emeryville requests permission from CTCDC to experiment with a new innovative type of traffic control device to enhance bicycle/pedestrian crossing safety and efficiency. A request to FHWA has been also submitted. Steve added that HAWK stands for High Intensity Activated Crosswalk beacon signal and is currently deployed in the City of Tucson, AZ on an experimental basis. The City of Tucson has installed over 51 HAWK signals with the approval from FHWA. He stated that a copy of the approval from FHWA to the City Tucson has been furnished to the Committee. He added that other devices such as In-Roadway Warning Lights and striping treatments does not improve pedestrian safe crossing. The City of Emeryville has used these devices, however they are not effective.

Steve Chan explained the functioning of the HAWK signal. Steve used a PowerPoint to go over the operation of the Hawk Signal. The Hawk signal uses traditional traffic and pedestrian signal heads but in a different configuration. In the absence of pedestrian actuation, the Hawk signal indication for main street vehicle is blank, meaning that the signal heads are not illuminated. The side street traffic is controlled by a stop sign. When a pedestrian places a call for the signal, the Hawk signal switches to flashing yellow (FY) indication to alert the driver at the main street that a pedestrian is waiting to cross. The Hawk signal goes through a sequence of yellow, red and pedestrian walk phase, just as a conventional signal would. When the pedestrian signal indication switches to a flashing don't walk (FDW), the vehicle indication on the main street becomes a flashing red (FR). At the FR, the driver needs to stop and proceed when it is safe. Would in this case the driver need to yield to pedestrians if they are in the crosswalk? Steve added that from the pedestrian perspective, the sequence of a conventional signal and Hawk signal are identical. Steve shared the phasing sequence with the Committee members and it is shown on the following page:

Figure 2: Phasing Sequences Comparison of 'Conventional' and 'HAWK' signals

Conventional Signal		HAWK Signal	
VEHICLES	PEDESTRIANS	VEHICLES	PEDESTRIANS
G	DW	blank	DW
G	DW	FY	DW
Y	DW	Y	DW
R	DW	R	DW
R	W	R	W
R	FDW	FR	FDW
R	DW	FR	DW
G	DW	blank	DW

Pedestrian Actuation →

Steve Chan stated that the benefit of Hawk signals is that the vehicle indications will be illuminated only when pedestrian crossing phase is activated. The vehicle traffic is delayed less than the conventional signal. The Hawk signal provides a controlled crossing at an intersection without requiring full traffic signal. The City of Tucson has documented improved pedestrian safety from the installation of 51 Hawk signals. There were two independent studies that showed improved pedestrian safety with Hawk signals.

Steve Chan stated that the City of Emeryville planned to install Hawk signals at the intersection of Powell Street and Doyle Street. Doyle Street is controlled by a stop sign. There is new housing project which will increase pedestrian/bicycle traffic, and the city would like to install a Hawk signal at this location to enhance the pedestrian safety. The City planned to do public education, will collect compliance on Main Street by the vehicle and pedestrian compliance plus the collision data including vehicles and pedestrians. The devices will be tested for four years. Steve asked for the approval from the Committee.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the City Santa Ana also wants to use Hawk signal as an experiment, however, they were not able to submit their request before the agenda was mailed out. Since, the experiment request was on the agenda, Chairman Mansourian asked the City of Santa Ana to present their proposal too.

Vinh Nguyen, City of Santa Ana, stated that the City is the most populated city in Orange County. The City has over 275 traffic signals and numerous uncontrolled crosswalks, pedestrian flashing beacons and in-pavement flashing lights. Pedestrian Safety issue is a challenge for the City and the City is upgrading pedestrian signs, including the flashing lights. The City continues to look for better ways to improve pedestrian safety and the Hawk beacon for pedestrian is a promising traffic control device that has been proven to be successful in the City of Tucson.

Vinh Nguyen went over again on the operation of the Hawk beacon signal which was earlier shared by the City of Emeryville.

Vinh Nguyen stated that the Taxes Transportation Institute funded by the Transit Cooperative Research Board Program (TCRP D-0*) and the national Cooperative Highway Research Board Program (NCHRP 3-71) conducted a study to evaluate the safety of pedestrians using various crossing treatments. The Hawk beacon signal and half signal received 97% motorists' compliance. Both the NCHRP and Road Safety Audit studies support the Hawk beacon signal for the pedestrian safety.

Vinh Nguyen further stated that the City would like to evaluate and experiment with Hawk beacon for five years. The City will collect and evaluate "before and after" data for the location where Hawk beacon signals are installed. The data will also include pedestrian and vehicle collision for three years before and after. The pedestrian and vehicle compliance and travel delay before and after. Vinh stated that in the event that a safety concern arises from the devices, the City would terminate the experimentation. The City will provide annual progress report to the Committee.

Chairman Mansourian asked whether Committee members had questions for Steve Chan and Vinh Nguyen.

Hamid Bahadori asked Steve Chan whether Hawk is a traffic signal.

Steve Chan responded that the standard conventional signal has red, yellow, and green signal heads, however, Hawk has only red and yellow heads. Therefore, Hawk is considered a beacon signal. It also activates when a pedestrian pushes the button for crossing.

Hamid Bahadori stated the phasing shown when a pedestrian has FDW the main street traffic has FR, which will create confusion. A pedestrian can step in the crosswalk at the FDW and with Hawk you allow vehicles to proceed with FR at the same time.

Lujuanna Lopez stated to Steve that the proposal is to provide a safe pedestrian crossing. Did this location have pedestrian crossing collisions or other pedestrian related safety problems?

Steve Chan stated that he has not reviewed the collision data to determine if there were pedestrian related collisions.

Hamid stated that it means there is not a pedestrian related problems.

Maurice Kavfman, City of Emeryville, responded that the City would compare the Hawk signal with other Pedestrian devices such as In-roadway Warning Lights and FB, etc.

Chairman Mansourian asked what the cost is for a Hawk signal.

Steve Chan responded that the cost is about the half that of a conventional signal.

Hamid Bahadori asked Vin Nguyen about the two locations proposed by the City of Santa Ana. If they do not meet minimum signal warrants, why is Hawk considered and on what basis?

Vinh Nguyen responded that this is not a three-head traffic signal, it is a FB.

Hamid Bahadori stated that if it goes to red and vehicles stop, then he believe it is a traffic signal.

Vinh Nguyen stated that this is a form of a pedestrian beacon and not a signal.

Jacob Babico asked what type of signing is being considered?

Vinh Nguyen responded regular pedestrian crossing signing.

Jacob Babico stated that pedestrian signing with overhead FB is not shown on the drawing. Usually, there are two downward arrowheads at the mast arm pointing towards the crosswalk. Jacob Babico further added that the perception of the motoring public would consider this as a traffic signal when they see a mast arm with more than one signal head.

Deborah Wong asked why not consider one FR instead of two FRs.

Vinh Nguyen responded that one FR signal head would be more like a conventional signal and two red signal heads would not be like conventional signal heads.

Chairman Mansourian stated that usually public comments are not needed for the experimentation request however, he will invite the public if they would like to say something in regards to the proposal.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the California Vehicle Code Section 21355 subdivision (a) states that "Stop signs shall not be erected at any entrance to an intersection controlled by official traffic control signals."

There were no other comments.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he is not ready to vote yes on the proposal because there are too many unanswered questions. First, according to the CVC, at a blank signalized intersection, a vehicle must consider it as a Stop controlled intersection. Second, CVC 21355, subdivision (a) states that "Stop signs shall not be erected at any entrance to an intersection controlled by official traffic control signals." Third, when an agency considers a traffic control device, there are some warrants or guidelines to follow. In this case, there are no guidelines or warrants which indicated that this location qualifies for the Hawk signals and other location does not qualify for the Hawks.

John Fisher stated that this concept has been discussed by the National Committee for a great length of time. The Committee struggled to identify whether this is a traffic signal or not. Final ruling by the Committee was, this is a beacon signal not a traffic signal. He also added that the City of Tucson in AZ has installed at a number of locations and they are working very well. The National Committee has recommended including it in the MUTCD. John further added that TTI and NCHRP have conducted studies, and compliance rate is well above the other pedestrian devices. Almost, 95% plus compliance is noted by the Hawk beacon signal.

John further added that in AZ, a stop sign could be mixed with signals. In CA, first you need to address the CVC before you consider this type of device.

Hamid Bahadori asked Lujuanna Lopez, CHP, if a motorist runs the red light at a Hawk signal under what section the motorist will be cited.

Lujaunna Lopez responded that would be running a red light.

Hamid stated that it means it is a traffic signal.

John Fisher asked Lopez, if there is flashing red beacon at a stop controlled intersection and if a motorist does not stop, then under what CVC section would the motorist be cited?

Lopez responded that it would be a violation of not stopping for a stop sign.

There were no other comments by the Committee members.

Motion: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Wayne Henley, authorize the experiment with Hawk signals for the City of Emeryville and the City of Santa Ana subject to the Hawk beacon signal not being conflict with the CVC.

The motion was failed 2-6 (John Fisher and Ed von Borstel voted yes).

There was another motion moved by Hamid Bahadori.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Jacob Babico, asked the City of Emeryville and the City of Santa Ana to clarify from a legal point of view if this is not a traffic signal by giving affects. Second, the CVC states that if a traffic signal is blank due to malfunction, it must be considered as stop sign operation, and third, CVC states that a stop sign shall not be erected at an intersection with traffic a signal. Also, there should be guidelines or warrants to determine if the location warrants for Hawk. Any conflict with FDW and FR.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Chairman Mansourian asked if the City of Emeryville and Santa Ana addresses the issues raised by the motion moved by Hamid Bahadori and wishes to place this item on the future agenda, they could.

01-4 Tactile Pedestrian Indicator With Audible Information

Chairman Mansourian stated that the City of Santa Cruz installed the pedestrian indicator with audible devices on Highway 1 with local streets. The City has submitted one preliminary report on December 10, 2001 and subsequent to that there was no updates provided by the City. However, on May 20, 2004, Caltrans adopted the California Supplement along with the MUTCD and these devices were adopted officially in California. Since then, the devices have been adopted in California officially, staff requested to the Committee to make a recommendation to remove this item from the "On-Going Experimentation" list.

There were no other comments.

Motion: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Jacob Babico, closing this item by removing it from the pending list.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Item will be removed from the On-Going Experimentation list.

7. Discussion Items

07-21 Proposal to Install Audible Features at the Uncontrolled Crosswalk

Chairman Mansourian stated that the proposal is to install audible features at uncontrolled crosswalks with in-roadway warning lights and it is a discussion item. Caltrans placed this item on the agenda to get input from the Committee members representing the Cities and Counties. The proposal to place audible message which say, "Crosswalk activated, proceed with caution, vehicle may not stop". He further stated that if Committee members support the proposal, then the item would be placed on the next CTCDC agenda as an action item.

John Fisher stated that he is not supportive of the proposed message, because there is already a message in brail for the visually impaired pedestrians. Secondly, the flashing lights are for the vehicle not for the pedestrians. A message which says that the lights have been activated is a false sense of security. Lights are for vehicles and they are only warning lights not forcing a vehicle to stop. The pedestrian should cross when it is safe to cross.

None of the other Committee members supported the concept and no one requested to place it on the agenda for further action.

Chairman Mansourian asked the staff to inform the City of Escalon that the Committee does not support the proposed concept.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be held in Northern California on October 11, 2007. The Workshop to discuss speed limit guidelines will be held on October 10, 2007.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.